

10400 Eaton Place
Suite 312
FAIRFAX, VA
Phone: (703) 385-5200
Fax: (703) 385-5080

KEATING & BENNETT LLP

Fax



FAXED

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 9 2003

To: Examiner Dougherty
Art Unit 2834

From: Christopher A. Bennett

Fax: 703-872-9319

Date: November 7, 2003

703-872-9306

Phone: _____ **Pages:** 8

Re: 09/811,660

CC: _____

Comments:

Dear Examiner Trinh,

After inquiring with the Group Receptionist regarding the above-identified application, it has come to our attention that the Request for Reconsideration that we faxed on August 11, 2003 has not been entered.

Accordingly, we enclosed hereto, a copy of the Request for Reconsideration as well as a copy of the Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission we received on August 11, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature of Christopher A. Bennett.

Christopher A. Bennett
For
KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
(Reg. No. 46,710)

11/07/2003 15:25 7033855080

KEATING & BENNETT

PAGE 02/08

08/11/03 18:19:38

USPTO->

7033855080 RightP'

Page 081

To:Auto-reply fax to 7033855080 COMPANY:

Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission



UNITED STATES
PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

TO: Fax Sender at 7033855080

Fax Information

Date Received:

Total Pages:

8/11/03 4:58:01 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

7 (including cover page)

ADVISORY: This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) section 306 et seq.

Received
Cover
Page
=====>

08/11/03 18:19:38 7033855080	KEATING & BENNETT	TIME 02/08
Info from Print		
Info 310 Print 1C Page 1 Fax 7033855080	Fax 7033855080	
KEATING & BENNETT LLP		
Fax		
To: <u>Joseph Dougherty</u> From: <u>Joseph H. Koenig</u>		
Fax: <u>703-321-7029</u> Date: <u>August 11, 2003</u>		
Phone: <u>703-321-0228</u> Pages: <u>1</u>		
Re: <u>06/01/1903</u> Ref: <u>601</u>		
20000.M27		
<Comments>		
Customer Dougherty		
Please find attached hereto the following documents for the above identified application:		
Request for Reconsideration.		
Handed by <u>Joseph H. Koenig</u>		
 Joseph H. Koenig for Keating & Bennett, LLP (fax/konig@uspto.gov/212-306)		

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to Group Art Unit 2834, 703-672-9319, addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: August 11, 2003



Sonia V. McLean

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
GROUP ART UNIT 2834**

PATENT
36856,447

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Akiteru TAKATSUKA et al.	Art Unit: 2834	RECEIVED CENTRAL MAIL CENTER NOV 07 2003
Serial No.: 09/811,660		OFFICE OF THE PATENT EXAMINER
Filed: March 19, 2001	Examiner: T. Dougherty	
Title: METHOD FOR SELECTING PIEZOELECTRIC TRANSFORMER CHARACTERISTIC		

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated May 15, 2003, please reconsider the above identified application in view of the following remarks.

On May 1, 2003, Applicants' counsel conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner. Applicants' counsel pointed out errors in the Office Action issued on April 22, 2003. The Examiner agreed and issued an Office Action on May 15, 2003. The present Request for Reconsideration is in response to the outstanding Office Action dated May 15, 2003.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US 5,424,602) in view of Lejeune (US 6,269,326).

Claims 4-6, 10-12, 16-18 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US 5,424,602) and Lejeune (US 6,269,326) in view of Onishi et al. (JP 2000-216450). Claims 4-6, 10-12, 16-18 and 22-24 were rejected